

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPIL No. 30 of 2017**

- Gayatri Suman W/o Shri Manharan Lal Narang, Aged About 37 Years R/o Near Church, Village Masturi, Tehsil And Post Masturi, Thana Masturi, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh Through Secretary, Department Of Revenue, Mantralaya, Naya Raipur Chhattisgarh,
2. Collector, Collectorate, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh,
3. S. D. O. Revenue, Sub Divisioin Bilha, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh,
4. Tehsildar, Tehsil Bilha, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh,
5. Nova Iron And Steel, Through Managing Director, Village Dagori, Tehsil Bilha, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondent

For Petitioner	Mr. Rahul Tamaskar, Advocate
For Respondent/State	Mr. Y.S. Thakur, Additional Advocate General
For Respondent No.5	Mr. Rajeev Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice**Hon'ble Shri Justice Prashant Kumar Mishra****Per, Ajay Kumar Tripathi, Chief Justice****24/7/2018**

1. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents, we are not convinced that a self-appointed conscious keeper claiming herself to be a social

worker can rake up the issue of individual causes specially when some of the affected persons in their individual capacity had already approached the High Court in different Writ Petitions sometime in the year 2013 and the orders came to be passed by the learned Single Judge disposing off those Writ Petitions leaving it to the individuals to approach the Collector for ventilation of their grievances.

2. It is also noticed that against such orders of the learned Single Judge, no appeal had been preferred by any of those parties. In other words, some kind of finality had been reached in the litigation set into motion by the aggrieved persons. In the above circumstances, that the Collector thereafter has acted upon the representations and passed orders rejecting such claim, we are not going to allow a self appointed social worker to raise issues representing the interest of all the so called affected persons, who were capable of fighting their own legal battles earlier with no success.
3. The WP(PIL) is accordingly dismissed.
4. The Court was inclined to impose heavy cost upon the petitioner but since the assurance was given at the bar that she will be careful in raising such matters in future under the PIL jurisdiction, giving the benefit of doubt, the cost is not imposed as a first opportunity.

Sd/-

(Ajay Kumar Tripathi)

Chief Justice

Sd/-

(Prashant Kumar Mishra)

Judge